

1 REMARKS

2 Amendments to the claims:

3 Please do not enter the previously filed after final amendments. The
4 amendments to the claims shown hereinabove are relative to the status of the claims
as of the final rejection mailed 01/10/2005.

5 Claims 1, 4, 10, and 27 have been amended as indicated herein above.
6 Support for the amendments to claims 1, 4, 10, and 27 is found at least in the claims
7 of the specification as originally filed. No new matter has been introduced by way of
8 the amendments to the claims.

9 Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

10 Claims 1-4, 6-13, 15, 16, and 25-27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §
11 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art (Applicant's background
12 section) in view of any one of U.S. Patent No. 3,664,912 ("Olson"), JP 08052827
13 ("Osogoshi et al."), or GB 1289387 ("Sendor et al.").

14 Claims 2-3, 6, 11, and 25-26 have been canceled as indicated herein above,
and therefore the rejections of those claims are now moot.

15 Of the remaining claims, the Applicant notes that claims 1, 10, and 27 are
16 independent claims, while claims 4, and 7-9 depend from claim 1, and claims 12-13,
17 and 15-16 depend from claim 10. Thus, if claim 1 is nonobvious, then it follows that
18 claims 4 and 7-9 are also nonobvious. Likewise, if claim 10 is nonobvious, then it
follows that claims 12-13, and 15-16 are also nonobvious.

19 As the Applicant has already noted in responses to previous office actions
20 issued in regard to this application, a *prima facie* case of obviousness requires that
21 "the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the
claim limitations."

22 The Applicant has amended claims 1, 10, and 27 to each now include at least
23 the following limitation:

24 Wherein the binding energy comprises ultrasonic energy.

25 The Applicant contends that none of the prior art references (either
individually or when combined) teach or suggest the above limitation that is now
included in claims 1, 10, and 27. The Applicant also notes that the Examiner has not

1 contended that any of the prior art references teach or suggest the above limitation
2 that is now included in claims 1, 10, and 27.

3 Accordingly, the Applicant contends that the amendments to claims 1, 10,
4 and 27 serve to overcome the obviousness rejections of those claims because none
5 of the prior art references (either individually or when combined) teach or suggest
6 the above limitation, which is now included in those claims.

7 As noted above, the amendments to claims 1 and 10 also serve to overcome
8 the obviousness rejections of claims 4, 7, 8, 9, and 12, 13, 15, 16 because these
9 claims depend from claims 1 and 10, respectively. The Applicant therefore
10 respectfully requests that the rejections of claims 1, 4, 7-10, 12-13, 15-16, and 27 be
11 withdrawn and that the claims be allowed.

12 Petition for Extension of Time:


13 The Applicants herewith petition the Commissioner of Patents and
14 Trademarks to extend the time for reply to the Office action dated January 10, 2005
15 for one month from April 10, 2005 to May 10, 2005. Please charge deposit account
16 number 08-2025 in the amount specified on the attached Transmittal Letter to cover
17 the cost of the extension. Any deficiency or overpayment should be charged or
18 credited to the above numbered deposit account.

19 SUMMARY

20 The Applicant believes that this response constitutes a full and complete
21 response to the Final Office Action, and that the application is in condition
22 for allowance.

23 The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the below-signed
24 representative if the Examiner believes this will facilitate prosecution toward
25 allowance of the claims.

Date: May 09, 2005

Respectfully submitted,
Roland Boss
By 
Thomas Olson
Reg. No. 44,271
Phone: (509) 327-4748

*Application S/N: 10/001,297
Atty. Docket No. 10011080-1
Request for Continued Examination*